

6. Tim Harris
Rationale for Urban
Limits within Selwyn
District

BEFORE THE CANTERBURY REGIONAL COUNCIL HEARING PANEL

UNDER of the Resource Management Act
1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of a hearing by the Canterbury
Regional Council Hearing Panel
on Proposed Change No.1 to the
Canterbury Regional Policy
Statement Chapter 12A
(Development of Greater
Christchurch) including Variations
1, 2, 3 and 4.

**STATEMENT OF TIMOTHY JOHN HARRIS
AS PART OF THE OFFICER REPORT UNDER SECTION 42A OF THE RESOURCE
MANAGEMENT ACT 1991**

1 My full name is **TIMOTHY JOHN HARRIS**.

Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses

2 I acknowledge that I have read the code of conduct for expert witnesses contained in the Environment Court's Practice Note dated 31 March 2005. I have complied with it when preparing my written statement of evidence and I agree to comply with it when I give any oral evidence.

Qualifications and experience

3 I am the Planning Manager for the Selwyn District Council. I hold the qualifications of Master of Regional and Resource Planning with Distinction from the University of Otago and I am a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute. I have worked in the field of planning and resource management for the last 13 years. During that time I have worked both in the private sector and for local government including being the Environmental Services Manager for Banks Peninsula District Council and the Manager for Resource Management at Christchurch City Council. I am familiar with the Selwyn District and its resource management issues and the Selwyn District Plan (SDP).

4 In my work I am very familiar with the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA 1991).

5 I am familiar with the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy 2007 (UDS). I am a member of the management group that was involved in the preparation of that Strategy. This group also managed the drafting of Proposed Change No.1 to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, Chapter 12A (Development in Greater Christchurch) (Proposed Change 1 (PC1)) that was notified in July 2007.

6 As a result, I am familiar with PC1 and the issues, objectives, policies and methods it sets out; particularly Policy 1 on the implementation of Urban Limit lines (ULs).

7 I was also involved with the preparation of SDC's submission on PC1 and have made staff recommendations to the SDC in respect of PC1 and Variation 1. Therefore I am familiar with Variation 1 being the Urban Limits and Total New Household Provision for Rolleston.

- 8 I therefore have a comprehensive knowledge of:
- (a) The growth issues facing the SDC;
 - (b) The context of SDC's growth management policy framework and such framework generally; and
 - (c) Why ULs have been implemented for the Selwyn District and the strategic and planning justifications for their proposed locations.

Scope of Evidence

- 9 I have been asked to provide evidence to support the justification and location of the ULs around the Selwyn District.
- 10 I begin with a brief overview of growth in the Selwyn District in recent years to provide some of the context to UDS implementation and the compact urban form approach being adopted. This provides background to the mechanisms being implemented through PC1 and Variation 1, including the use of urban limits.
- 11 Secondly I describe the settlement pattern for Selwyn District proposed by PC1. The UDS and PC1 do not encompass the entire Selwyn district, but is limited to the geographic area within approximate commuting distance (refer to map in Attachment 1).
- 12 Thirdly, I describe the framework for managing growth in the operative Selwyn District Plan.
- 13 Fourthly, I explain the rationale and assumptions for the urban limits (ULs) proposed for the various settlements in the Selwyn district, and make comment on submissions seeking to extend the urban limits.
- 14 I then make my conclusions.

SELWYN DISTRICT AND THE UDS

- 15 As will be covered in the evidence briefs of Mr Tremaine and Mr McCallum on the Officer's Report to PC1, the UDS represents collaborative efforts between the NZ Transport Agency, the Canterbury Regional Council (CRC), Christchurch City, Waimakariri and Selwyn District Councils, to set a medium term vision for the sub-region. The UDS sets a framework for managing growth that directs the bulk of the

growth toward existing towns and urban areas, with some provision for rural and rural-residential living.

- 16 The UDS development phase identified a significant number of trends and issues that if left unmanaged, were increasingly poised to change the way of life in the Selwyn District beyond the ability of the SDC to manage them in the interests of its residential and business communities. For example, the UDS forecasts that by 2041, the Selwyn District's population would double. Growth rates in the Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts have exceeded Christchurch City's over the past 11 years, and are two of the fastest growing TA areas in the country.¹ The Selwyn District has grown from a 1991 population of 21,300 to 33,700 (2006 census). The Selwyn Growth Model² projects further growth will swell the Selwyn District to approximately 67,593 by 2041.
- 17 The UDS establishes a settlement pattern for residential, commercial, business and rural residential growth to 2041 and beyond to enable long-term community and infrastructure planning. It also sets up a strong monitoring framework to ensure that population projections are adjusted to reflect the growth indicated by building consent data
- 18 The rapid growth that Selwyn District is experiencing has created issues such as:
- (a) the availability of, and ability of Council to provide appropriate affordable infrastructure;
 - (b) difficulties in integrating new development with existing townships in the District; and
 - (c) retaining the sense of identity and character of the District that in part is based on a sense of open rural space.
- 19 Concerns have been raised with the SDC over an increasing lack of cohesiveness in the towns, and that Selwyn District's towns are largely becoming dormitory suburbs of Christchurch City. Given forecasted growth rates for the District, and in line with the UDS, the SDC views the containment of townships as necessary to achieve community aspirations to maintain rural amenity and sense of openness relative to the urban environment of the City. A key part of the UDS settlement philosophy is

¹ UDS, page 28; Statistics New Zealand, Demographic Trends: 2007, 9 Subnational demographic projections, pages 156-157.

² The Selwyn Growth Model was adopted by SDC in 23 April 2008 to provide a common basis for all forward planning, and underpins the LTCCP. It expresses growth in household, population and labour force terms and has a horizon to 2041, so as to be consistent with the UDS.

supporting the larger settlements of Rolleston and Lincoln to develop as Key Activity Centres³ so that they are better able to meet the needs of residents.

20 A number of key actions and approaches relating to ULs are contained in the UDS. The SDC has agreed to support the 20 most critical actions and approaches as a UDS partner. These actions include:

- (a) Preparing PC1 being Chapter 12A of the Regional Policy Statement.
- (b) Developing integrated transport and land use programmes and patterns for the development of funded transport projects.
- (c) Establishing the capital requirements for key sub-regional infrastructure for the 2009-19 Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) period.
- (d) Reflecting infrastructure staging and timing within respective LTCCPs to give effect to the preferred long-term sub-regional growth pattern, including staging and timing.
- (e) Preparing and implementing appropriate district plan changes to deliver the sub-regional settlement pattern set out in the UDS including activity centres, intensification areas, rural residential provision, and urban activities.

21 Workshops held in August / September of 2006 as part of preparation of the UDS debated several growth issues affecting the study area. An issue of importance to the Selwyn district was the desire to maintain uniqueness and character despite the rapid growth. The UDS addresses these issues by setting out a sub-regional policy framework that:

- (a) Reinforces Selwyn's desire to maintain its uniqueness and individual character;
- (b) Encourages some townships to become more self-sufficient, without attempting to duplicate the range of facilities that are in Christchurch City;
- (c) Provides a mandate for district plan changes that reflect the UDS (ie through Proposed Change 1 to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement 1998)⁴;

³ Key Activity Centres are defined in Change 1 as key existing and proposed commercial/business centres identified as focal points for employment and the transport network and suitable for more intensive mixed-use development.

⁴ District Plans are required to give effect to Regional Policy Statements and it is anticipated that our District Plan will require significant changes to it, to reflect the Urban Development Strategy and Regional Policy Statement.

- (d) Sets a broad framework for growth within which the SDC can facilitate market-driven township growth through mechanisms such as structure plans or outline development plans;
- (e) Reinforces the SDC's support for the I-zone Southern Business Hub being the main industrial centre in the District, and encourages vibrant town centres in Rolleston and Lincoln through a range of mechanisms;
- (f) Sets density targets to encourage a full range of section sizes in a township to accommodate all ages and the increase of single person households. An initial target density of 15 houses per hectare was reduced to 10 through negotiation with the other UDS Partners, so as to maintain sections that are more spacious than elsewhere. This notion of open space is a feature of the Selwyn District;
- (g) Encourages new growth to be designed in a manner that encourages connections to the existing township;
- (h) Establishes strong township limits that are large enough to accommodate projected future growth and maintain open space.

22 The workshops identified potential areas physically suitable for growth in the Selwyn district well in excess of projected growth. These were then subjected to further testing to assess their suitability and priority for development. The analysis was undertaken by a project team comprising planning and infrastructure staff, with recommendations made to SDC.

23 This resulted in urban limit lines being drawn for each of the towns, with the exception of Rolleston. The presence of airport noise contours immediately to the south of the town meant that it was very difficult to plan for the expansion of the town. Environment Court proceedings (C138/2007) on airport noise contour modelling concluded in November 2007 and this paved the way for detailed work on the form and direction of township growth as part of the Rolleston Structure Plan.

Proposed Change 1 (PC1)

24 PC1 will bring the UDS settlement pattern into the RMA 1991 planning framework. This was done to ensure that the UDS was considered in planning decisions under

- the RMA 1991. PC1 contains provisions relevant to the UDS area only. This includes the townships of West Melton, Rolleston, Springston, Lincoln, Prebbleton, and Tai Tapu.
- 25 PC1 has an allocation model for growth. It describes population growth in terms of household numbers and allocates them spatially and temporally, as Table 1 Policy 6 demonstrates (refer to Attachment 2).
- 26 This table applies the consolidation approach whereby the majority of the 11,890 households for Selwyn District is directed towards the townships.
- 27 The township component is further allocated based on considerations of infrastructure capacity, land constraints, and relationships between the towns. The allocation results in the growth distributed primarily to Rolleston and Lincoln, with some to Prebbleton, and to existing zoned land in West Melton (refer to Table 2, Policy 6 Attachment 2).
- 28 More than 50% of the submissions to PC1 sought to further extend the proposed ULs. Approximately 20% of those submissions have a geographical reference to the Selwyn District, and seek inclusion in the urban limit. There already exists within the UL, sufficient land for projected growth to 2041. This land was identified for a number of reasons including the integration and coordination of infrastructure and community aspirations. Furthermore, if further land is included within the urban limit, there are implications for the yields outlined in Table 2 Policy 6 and the minimum densities required by Policy 11. Notwithstanding these concerns, some of the submissions are supported as noted in Section 6.
- 29 In cases like *Shaw v Selwyn District Council (C67/2004)*, and *McFarlane Group Developments v Selwyn District Council (C38/2005)*, the Environment Court found that the current Canterbury RPS 1998 was not definitive enough in terms of policies in relation to the location of development.
- 30 The provisions of PC1 are more definitive. The objective of consolidation supported by urban limits that encompass sufficient land for a 35 year horizon provide clear direction to the Selwyn District.

THE SELWYN DISTRICT PLAN 2008

- 31 The operative Selwyn District Plan emphasises the role of private developers and landowners by encouraging private plan changes to rezone land.
- 32 The UDS area is, with some minor exception, zoned Rural – Inner Plains in the operative Selwyn District Plan, with a minimum allotment size of 4 hectares. The Plan does recognise existing Development Areas, such as Devine Acres, near Templeton, that may have smaller allotments.
- 33 The Plan recognises the need for a range of section sizes and seeks to maintain the spacious character and amenity values of townships. New growth areas are anticipated to be made available through private plan changes. Three sets of policies provide guidance for the growth of townships. General policies and town form policies seek growth at compatible densities and in locations that adjoin towns. Specific township policies provide guidance on preferred directions for growth and address any issues that pertain to particular townships.
- 34 The UDS (and its sub-regional policy framework being implemented via PC1) represents a fundamental shift in approach to growth management and Selwyn District has committed to a programme of district plan changes as part of its commitment under the UDS to amend the district plan.

SELWYN URBAN LIMITS FOR PROPOSED CHANGE 1 TO THE RPS

- 35 The following key assumptions were made in the analysis of growth directions and setting of urban limits for the Selwyn District:
- (a) The UDS provided guiding principles such as the intent to consolidate growth to existing townships;
 - (b) The UDS sets the broad settlement pattern whereby Rolleston and Lincoln are to be the larger towns in the Selwyn District with some growth to Prebbleton.
 - (c) Growth was directed to those townships that either had existing servicing capacity or were not severely constrained in the provision of further capacity. This reinforced the importance of Rolleston;
 - (d) Considerable growth was directed to the main centres of Lincoln and Rolleston so as to be able to support their development as Key Activity Centres for the district;

- (e) Springston and Tai Tapu (which have major constraints), and West Melton (which was not identified as a key activity centre) were not proposed to grow beyond land already zoned for residential purposes in the District Plan;
- (f) Growth had to be distributed between towns within the overall cap of allocation to the Selwyn District. This approach was a deliberate intent of the UDS to encourage a range of housing choices and densities across the UDS study area;
- (g) Land that had an urban zoning was assumed to provide yields consistent with that zoning;
- (h) Land that had a rural zoning, was assumed to be developed at minimum densities of 10 households per hectare in line with the requirements of Policy 11 of PC1;
- (i) Generally a yield of 70% was assumed, except where parcels were heavily fragmented, where yields of 50% were used;
- (j) Infill capacity was assumed to be zero⁵ because of the uncertainties of accurately estimating likely yield. Infill capacity is affected by existing configuration of lots, and placement of houses and other buildings.

36 The allocations of growth sought to ensure there was sufficient land for projected growth within the UL, and that the key activity centres of Rolleston and Lincoln had a reasonable chance of moving towards self sufficiency (refer to Policy 4 of PC1) while the character of the smaller towns was maintained.

37 It was also recognised that more detailed planning and analysis could identify further information that would suggest that the location of the urban limit lines for the District should change. Policy 12 of PC1 provides for amendments to the urban limit as a result of the preparation of Outline Development Plans.

38 Other assumptions in the development of ULs for the District included noting that the inclusion of land within the urban limit did not confer it zoning or development rights. SDC must still assess the suitability of the land in question through district plan changes and resource consent decisions.

39 Sequencing assumptions were addressed with the following considerations:

⁵ Infill capacity defined as the capacity of zones within towns to absorb additional households through further subdivision to minimum zone standards of the District Plan.

- (a) Existing zones developing first, followed by;
- (b) A practical rollout of infrastructure recognising that in Rolleston there is a natural tension between desirable sequencing for roading and sewerage; and
- (c) As much as possible, ensuring that staging spanned land ownership so as to avoid possible monopolistic situations.

Rolleston Urban Limit

- 40 Rolleston is a satellite town to the City and is located approximately 15 minutes by car from the outskirts of Christchurch or 40 minutes to central Christchurch, along State Highway 1, and on the railway line where the Midland line to the west coast leaves the main trunk line. It has a 2008 estimated population of 6,800 (Selwyn Growth Model). Residential growth has been confined to the southern side of the state highway, with the development of the Izone Southern business hub on the north. This is an industrial park developed and funded by the Selwyn District Council.
- 41 Although previously proposed as a New Town in the 1970's, it did not expand in a major way until two plan changes (14 and 60) opened extensive areas for urban growth. Combined, these plan changes provided for a township of 14,000 population, though fragmentation of titles means it is unlikely this figure will be achieved.
- 42 Detailed planning for the growth of the town was initiated early in 2008 as a structure planning exercise. The first part of that project was to develop an urban limit to support notification of Variation 1 to PC1 of the RPS. Residential growth was directed towards the south and east of the existing town, resulting in a more rectangular shape to the town. The urban limit follows Dunns Crossing Road (on the western side of Rolleston), Selwyn Road (parallel to the State Highway), and Weedons Road (to the east). It then steps around the noise contours and follows cadastral boundaries to the State Highway.
- 43 The following assumptions were considered in locating the urban limits:
- (a) No expansion of residential development was proposed on the northern side of the state highway to avoid possible severance issues arising;
 - (b) The remodelled noise contour for Christchurch International Airport should be avoided;

- (c) That land affected by the previous contours that remain in the operative Selwyn District Plan was available for urban growth;
- (d) That Weedons Road and Levi Road (envisaged as rural arterial links under the Christchurch to Rolleston and Environs Transportation Study) will form a new entrance to Rolleston and that it would be desirable from a transport efficiency perspective to protect these roads from a proliferation of access points. While this can be done through planning tools (eg restricting the number of access points), this can lead to perverse outcomes such as long continuous fencing, which in turn requires additional planning controls;
- (e) Growth to the west (towards Burnham) is constrained by the possibility of expanding the existing sewage plant and disposal field to accommodate the growth envisaged by the PC1.
- (f) That the town would require land for additional commercial activity, as well as open space, and community facilities (eg pre-schools, emergency services, and churches). The inclusion of approximately 74 hectares of land for these activities within the urban limit was noted, though it should be recognised these were preliminary estimates and the structure plan may determine the final requirements to be different.
- (g) Expansion of Rolleston towards the east along Levi's Road and adjoining the state highway is limited by the need to pump sewage. While this is feasible, it would incur additional ongoing cost to the community compared to land that can be gravity serviced. By locating development next to the state highway it exacerbates potential for reverse sensitivity noise effects, and a small portion of the area towards Weedons road is bisected by the airport noise contours. For these reasons, most of the area bounded by the State highway, Levi Road and Weedons Road has been excluded from the urban limit;
- (h) Sewer infrastructure for the bulk of the expansion is logically provided southwards along Dunns Crossing road, and then from a west to east direction towards Weedons road;
- (i) Transportation linkages are best provided along west/east alignments.

- 44 Sequencing generally follows a west to east alignment to enable a logical roll-out of infrastructure. Reduced yield is anticipated from Outline Development Plan Area no. 1 to provide for a 100 metre setback from the State Highway for the purposes of noise mitigation. Generally a yield of 70% has been applied over the whole area, with a reduced yield of 50% from Branthwaite Drive (Outline Development Plan Area no. 8), because the area has been developed as large lot rural lifestyle allotments (approximately 4ha) accessed by a cul-de-sac and further subdivision will be problematic.

Lincoln Urban Limit

- 45 Lincoln is a long established rural service town located on the Liffey Stream and approximately 15 minutes drive south-west of Christchurch. It has an estimated 2008 population of almost 3,200. It has a wide range of convenience stores located around a village square and along the main street. The University and Crown Research Institutes generate significant traffic flow into the town but are not well integrated with the town. Community facilities include a police station, community hall, service centre and library and a high school. Detailed planning for the future of Lincoln began in 2006 with the:
- (a) Lincoln Structure Plan (LSP); and
 - (b) Integrated Stormwater Catchment Management Plan (ICMP).
- 46 The LSP sought to develop a plan for growth that addressed existing problems of poor connectivity and reinforced the character of the town. It encapsulated an urban design framework that sought integrated solutions. A range of 'networks' (movement, open space, waterways, social and land use) were mapped and assessed to identify opportunities and constraints. The resulting land use pattern provides for a range of housing densities, sufficient land for the community and business activities needed in a Key Activity Centre and reinforces the primacy of the town centre supported by neighbourhood centres.
- 47 The LSP also mapped an outer growth edge over a planning horizon to 2041 (being consistent with the UDS). The edge of development then formed the urban limit. The north-eastern boundary of projected growth was based on a landform rather than cadastral boundaries. The final structure plan, adopted by Council in May 2008, amended this to follow cadastral boundaries and it is anticipated that this will be amended as per Policy 12 of PC1.

48 Submission 209 to PC1 is supported as it encompasses land assessed as appropriate for residential growth under the Lincoln Structure Plan. Submission 228 is also supported as it rectifies what appears to be a drafting error, and aligns the urban limit with a cadastral boundary.

49 The LSP established a staging strategy to enable the logical and cost-effective provision of infrastructure. Residential expansion beyond existing zones is directed northwards toward Tancred's Road and to the east towards Ellesmere Road to avoid constraints of land ownership by the Crown, and the high water table south of the town. Servicing is envisaged to progress from the south to the north to take advantage of landfall to the south, and to enable the orderly and logical provision of infrastructure.

Prebbleton Urban limit

50 Prebbleton is a small town located approximately 800m at its closest point from Christchurch, and sits astride Birches Road. It has a primary school and a small strip of shopping along Birches Road. It has an estimated 2008 population of slightly over 2,100 (Selwyn Growth Model).

51 The Environment Court had issued several decisions regarding growth in Prebbleton with the latest being C116/2006, that was supplemented by a map showing indicative boundaries (refer Attachment 3). This became Appendix 31 to the Township Volume of the operative District Plan.

52 The urban limit reinforces the Court Decisions by constraining the north-south elongation of the town, preferring instead growth towards the west and east. Growth to the west extends to the Kingcraft Drive Existing Development Area (1 hectare minimum allotments). Eastward expansion of the town is constrained by a high water table inhibiting the availability of satisfactory affordable stormwater dispersal.

West Melton Urban Limit

53 West Melton is located on State Highway 73, approximately 15 minutes from the north-western edge of Christchurch. It has a population of 166 (estimated 2008), with a school, community hall, pub, and garage. The recent Gainsborough subdivision on the northern side of the State Highway will see the town double in size, and there is capacity for a further 570 households in existing zoned land.

⁶ Selwyn Growth Model

- 54 The primary limitation to West Melton was a desire not to reinforce separation of the township by growth on both sides of the State Highway 73.
- 55 Another problem is the limited capacity of State Highway and Weedons-Ross Road intersection.
- 56 There were also community concerns expressed over the recent rapid growth of West Melton, and the probability of further expansion through take-up of existing zoned land.
- 57 Three options were considered for West Melton during preparation of the UDS:
- (a) No further residential zoning;
 - (b) Some additional growth (approx 1200 households);
 - (c) Considerable additional growth (approx 2900 households).
- 58 Council confirmed option (a) on the basis that it did not wish to make the degree of investment indicated as necessary for options (b) and (c) to succeed. In addition, there are servicing constraints (lack of water) and concerns over servicing the town with public transport.

Templeton

- 59 Templeton is not recognised as a township in the Selwyn District Plan. Templeton's growth is on the northern side of State Highway 1, within the administrative boundary of the Christchurch City Council.
- 60 On the southern side of the State Highway, and inside Selwyn District, is the Devine Acres Existing Development Area, which has a minimum subdivision requirement of 0.5 hectare. Growth of Templeton at urban densities into the Selwyn District has been resisted by Selwyn Council because of sewer constraints, and issues of severance if urban development is permitted on the south side in the Selwyn District.

Tai Tapu

- 61 The township is located approximately 15 minutes south of the City. It has developed shopping along the Christchurch-Akaroa Road (State Highway 75) with residential environments' either side of the highway. These are predominantly

minimum section sizes of 800m² (Living 1A zone) with a small pocket of 0.5 hectares lots (Living 2A), and has a estimated 2008 population of 470.

- 62 The SDC anticipates little growth for this town but the Urban Limit lines were included to ensure that the public have an idea of the SDC's intentions on limiting Tai Tapu's growth to uptake of existing zoning capacity.
- 63 The major reasoning for limiting Tai Tapu's growth is due to being a low-lying township located within the 'Lower Plains Flood Area'. This and the high water table in this location increases the potential for flooding as indicated in the Planning Maps and in the Proposed District Plan. Tai Tapu is also located within the Halswell Drainage District.
- 64 Wastewater capacity is fully utilised and any additional capacity is likely to be expensive. The existing urban area is dependent on pumping to relieve stormwater flooding. Any additional urban development is unlikely to be satisfactorily mitigated and will compound the problem.

Springston

- 65 A township of 460 population (2008 Selwyn Growth Model), Springston is located approximately three minutes west of Lincoln, in an area of high groundwater which periodically rises to the surface. Further urban development will compound the problem. Growth is not anticipated for Springston but urban limits were drawn around existing residential zones to provide clarity that growth is limited to uptake of existing zoning capacity.

CONCLUSION

- 66 Unlike other parts of the country, that part of Selwyn District within the Greater Christchurch area is relatively unconstrained by physical or geographic limitations. In the process of developing the UDS, land identified as potentially suitable for residential development was well in excess of projected growth. The UDS sought to prioritise land development, based on a combination of factors, including infrastructure capacity and affordability, land constraints and community aspirations.
- 67 PC1 and the Variations seek to confirm the UDS settlement pattern in the RMA planning framework such that resource consent and plan change decisions are consistent with the adopted strategy. The urban limits identified in Proposed Change

1 to the RPS and Variation 1 provide sufficient land to accommodate projected growth, and will achieve the objectives of the Change.

- 68 In my opinion, the limits have been drawn sufficiently wide to provide sufficient areas for growth to a horizon of 2041. They have been developed with a reasonable level of analysis and community participation. They represent a reasonable estimation of land required for growth to 2041 and enable certainty for infrastructure planning and community development.
- 69 Changes to the urban limits are however anticipated to occur and are expressly provided for in policy 12 in relation to Outline Development Plan areas. In addition policy 15 recognises that projections may change and anticipates several situations where changes to the extent, location or timing of development may be warranted. In my view these provisions strike the appropriate balance between certainty for long-term planning and flexibility to accommodate unforeseen change.
- 70 This is not to say that other parcels of land do not have some aspects of suitability for residential development in line with those within the urban limits, but in my opinion changes to the urban limits, other than through the exercise of policies 12 and 15, should be supported by an equivalent degree of community consultation, detailed analysis and infrastructure sequencing and setting within a policy framework for Greater Christchurch as is provided for by the the UDS, Proposed Change 1 and Variation 1, LTCCP's and related transport policy and implementation documents
- 71 I support regional and territorial local authorities working together to manage urban development for both the overall benefit of Greater Christchurch and the respective communities within it. I am satisfied that PC1 and Variation 1 enable those benefits to be obtained in an RMA context

Tim Harris

19 December 2008

Attachment 1



Attachment 2

Extracts, from the Revised Plan PC1 incorporating Officers Recommendations on Decisions Requested, 19 December 2008.

Table 1: Provision for Projected Household Growth in Greater Christchurch 2007- 2041

	2007- 16 Households	2017- 26 Households	2027- 41 Households
Selwyn District			
Zoned and proposed greenfield areas**	+3700	+3900	+3440
Rural Residential Areas (outside Urban Limits)^	+200	+200	+200
Existing Rural Zoning	+100	+100	+50
Total	+4000	+4200	+ 3690

** Greenfields Areas includes existing undeveloped zoned land at Pegasus, Woodend, Rangiora, Aidanfield, Masham, Port Hills, Lincoln, West Melton, Prebbleton and Rolleston.

^ Up to a maximum of the stated number

Table 2: Development Sequencing for Greater Christchurch 2007 - 2041

Selwyn District	Map Notations for greenfield areas	2007- 2016	2017- 2026 House - holds	2027-2041 House- holds	Total Available Households
<u>New Growth Areas</u> ⁷					
<u>Lincoln (zoned)</u>		820	0	0	820
Lincoln		930480	9051100	42901500	34253080
Rolleston	SR3	328	0	0	328
	SR4	50	0	0	50
	SR5	509	0	0	509
	SR6	135	0	0	135
	SR7	108	470	0	578
	SR8	0	362	0	362
	SR9	0	523	0	523
	SR10	0	294	0	294
	SR11	0	513	0	513
	SR12	0	143	371	514
	SR13	0	0	776	776
	SR14	0	0	471	471
	SR15	0	0	430	430
<u>West Melton (zoned)</u>		570	0	0	570
<u>Prebbleton (zoned)</u>		470	0	0	470
Prebbleton		700230	495	0	4195725
Total		3330370	3705390	33383440	4037311040

